

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 and 37-39 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 1, 10, and 19 to further clarify the invention and claims 3, 6, 28, 37, and 38 to cure minor informalities. In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claims 41-45, which are clearly supported throughout the specification *e.g.* ¶ 42. In addition, Applicant cancels claim 40.

I. Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner withdrew the previous rejections. The Examiner, however, found new grounds for rejecting the claims. In particular, claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and claims 1-35 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

II. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner contends that the specification does not disclose the second computer connecting to the *same* queue manager (*see* page 2 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following comments.

An exemplary, non-limiting embodiment of the present invention discloses the second application connecting to the queue manager and retrieving the message from the message queue (¶ 108). In particular, in an exemplary, non-limiting embodiment of the present invention, pseudo code is provided depicting exemplary operations of putting the message into the queue and retrieving the message from the queue. As explained in ¶¶ 163-175 (pages 47-49) of the specification, for example, the first computer (that puts the message into the queue) connects to

the queue manager "SANJOSE.QUERY.MANAGER" and as explained in ¶¶ 177-189 (pages 47-49) of the specification, the second computer (that retrieves the message from the queue) connects to the queue manager "SANJOSE.QUERY.MANAGER." In other words, the first and second computers connect to the same queue manager "SANJOSE.QUERY.MANAGER" to put or retrieve message from the queue ("SYSTEM.DEFAULT.LOCAL.QUEUE"). It will be appreciated that the foregoing remarks relate to the invention in a general sense, the remarks are not necessarily limitative of any claims and are intended only to help the Examiner better understand the allegedly unsupported aspects of the claims mentioned above.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 39.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and Statement of Substance of Interview

Claims 1-35 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by a reference titled "Microsoft Message Queuing Services," Windows NT Server - release 1.0, Microsoft Corporation, 1997 (hereinafter "Microsoft reference"). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection in view of the following comments.

To be an "anticipation" rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every element and recitation of the Applicant's claims. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art. Thus, the reference must clearly and unequivocally disclose every element and recitation of the claimed invention. MPEP § 2131.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courteous telephonic interview on February 21, 2007. The Statement of Substance of the Interview is as follows:

During the interview independent claim 1 was discussed in view of the Microsoft Reference. Specifically, independent claim 1 *inter alia* recites: “wherein the first computer, the second computer, and the server form part of a federated content management system and wherein the federated content management system further comprises heterogeneous servers connected to the server computer.” The Office Action indicates that page 6 of the Microsoft reference discloses the above-quoted unique features of claim 1 (*see* page 10 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Microsoft reference relates to a message queuing in which the sending application places a message into a queue and the receiving application retrieves the message from a queue (*see* pages 4 and 8-9). The Microsoft reference further discloses that this queuing technique operates independently of network protocols and any application that knows the name of another application’s request queue can send requests and receive responses regardless of network type. The application can generate and send business event data to other applications (*see* page 6).

However, in the Microsoft reference, there is no disclosure or suggestion of the first and second computers and the messaging server being part of the federated content management system. The Microsoft reference only discloses forwarding business event data and that the applications can send and receive messages regardless of network type but there is no disclosure or suggestion of the federated content management system further comprising heterogeneous servers.

Since the Microsoft reference only discloses applications communicating regardless of the network type and fails to disclose a federated content management system comprising heterogeneous servers, the rejection is improper as it lacks “sufficient specificity” required under

102. “[A]nticipation under § 102 can be found only when the reference discloses exactly what is claimed and that where there are differences between the reference disclosure and the claim, the rejection must be based on § 103 which takes differences into account.” *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); MPEP § 2131.

For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the Microsoft reference. The Examiner indicated that claim 1 is broad and will require further careful consideration. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-9 and 39.

In addition, dependent claim 3 recites: “a content identifier comprises an item identifier and a server name.” The Office Action alleges that page 8 of the Microsoft reference discloses these unique features of claim 3 (*see* page 5 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Microsoft reference discloses a MSMQueue object is used to identify the destination queue. The Microsoft reference further discloses that the body holds application-specific content of the message and a Label that describes the message and that can be viewed by the administrator. In the message, additional message properties such as message timeout values, delivery modes and name of a response queue may be provided (pages 8 and 10 of the Microsoft reference). However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of the Label including an item identifier and server name. In the Microsoft reference, the Label (*alleged* content identifier) describes the message but there is no disclosure or suggestion of the Label including an item identifier and a server name. Therefore, for at least these additional exemplary reasons,

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
U.S. Appl. No. 09/750,489
Attorney Docket No.: A8118

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable from the Microsoft reference. The Examiner indicated that claim 3 will require further careful consideration.

Dependent claim 6 recites: “the message comprises zero text and one or more content identifiers that represent items in a data store connected to the server computer.” The Office Action alleges that the Microsoft reference discloses these unique features of claim 6 on page 8 (*see* page 5 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is no disclosure or suggestion of a Label that would represent items in a data store connected to the server computer. For at least these additional exemplary reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is patentably distinguishable from the Microsoft reference. The Examiner indicated that claim 6 will require further careful consideration.

Next, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection with respect to the rest of the claims 10-35, 37-39. Of these claims, only claims 10, 19, 28, and 35 are independent. Among a number of unique features not taught by the Microsoft reference, claims 10 and 19 contain features that are similar to the features argued above with respect to claim 1, those arguments are respectfully submitted to apply with equal force here. For at least substantially analogous exemplary reasons, therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of the independent claims 10 and 19 and their dependent claims 11-18, 20-27, and 39.

Independent claim 28 *inter alia* recites: “when the body of said message comprises said content identifier, at least one object is forwarded to the second application, and when the body of said message comprises no said text and no said content identifier, the message is an event notification notifying the second application of an occurrence of an event.” The Office Action

alleges that page 6 of the Microsoft reference discloses the above-quoted unique features of claim 28 (*see* page 7 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully notes that page 6 of the Microsoft reference only discloses business event data but fails to disclose or suggest that when the body of said message comprises said content identifier, forwarding at least one object is to the second application and when the body of said message comprises no said text and no said content identifier, the message is an event notification notifying the second application of an occurrence of an event. The Microsoft reference only discloses sending business event data and does not disclose or even remotely suggest the above-quoted unique features of claim 28. For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 28 is patentably distinguishable from the Microsoft reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 28 and its dependent claims 29-34. The Examiner indicated that claim 28 requires further search and consideration.

In addition, dependent claim 29 recites: “said content identifier identifies a search result of a search performed by said first application, and wherein said search result comprises at least one object stored in said at least one server computer” and dependent claim 30 recites: “wherein the system is a federated content management system.” As explained above, the Microsoft reference is unrelated to the federated content management system. There is no suggestion or mention in the Microsoft reference of a federated content management system and performing searches in these systems. Applicant respectfully submits that the Microsoft reference does not disclose or suggest the message identifying a search result of a search performed by the first application and the result comprising an object stored in the server computer. Further, the Microsoft reference does not disclose or suggest the federated content management system. For

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
U.S. Appl. No. 09/750,489
Attorney Docket No.: A8118

at least these additional exemplary reasons, claims 29 and 30 are patentably distinguishable from the Microsoft reference. The Examiner agreed that claim 29 is not disclosed in the Microsoft reference. The Examiner indicated that further search will be performed once a formal response is submitted.

Independent claim 35 recites: “said text length value identifies length of text included in said message, and wherein the content identifier count value identifies a number of content identifiers in said message.” The Office Action contends that page 6 of the Microsoft reference discloses the above-quoted unique features of claim 35 (*see* page 8 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully notes that page 6 of the Microsoft reference only discloses business event data but fails to disclose or suggest that the text length value identifies length of text and the content identifier count value identifies a number of content identifiers in said message. The Microsoft reference only discloses sending business event data and does not disclose or even remotely suggest the above-quoted unique features of claim 35. For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 35 is patentably distinguishable from the Microsoft reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 35 and its dependent claims 37 and 38. The Examiner agreed that claim 35 is not disclosed by the Microsoft reference. The Examiner indicated that he will perform further search once a formal response is submitted.

IV. New Claims

New claims 41-45 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1 or claim 28. The Examiner further indicated that new claim 41 overcomes the prior art of record.


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
U.S. Appl. No. 09/750,489
Attorney Docket No.: A8118

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 28, 2007

Attorney Docket No.: A8118